

## REMARKS

Claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of claim 2, which is now canceled, and to clarify that the file interface arrangements includes a processor arrangement that is in addition to the processor arrangement of the data processing system for which the file interface arrangement provides NFS access. The amendments are made for the purpose of expediting prosecution and not for patentability, and claim 2 is cancelled without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to pursue subject matter of the original claims (prior to amendment) and subject matter of the canceled claims in subsequent prosecution. Claims 1, 3-7 and 16-25 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Office Action does not establish that claims 1-7 and 16-25 are unpatentable under 35 USC §103(a) over "Abdelnur" (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,640 to Abdelnur et al.) in view of "Boutcher" (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,768 to Boutcher). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action fails to show that all the limitations are suggested by the references.

In order to understand how the Abdelnur-Boutcher combination is not shown to suggest the invention, it may be helpful to first consider independent claim 18.

The limitations of claim 18 clearly demonstrate that the Abdelnur-Boutcher combination is not shown to suggest the claimed invention. Claim 18 sets forth a data processing system with both a network interface card and a file interface card, both of which are coupled to the system I/O bus. Abdelnur's element 720 of FIG. 7 only shows a communications interface. There is no apparent suggestion of both a network interface card and a file interface card. Furthermore, Boutcher does not suggest implementing the network interface 28 in FIG. 2 with both a network interface card and a file interface card. Therefore, the Office Action fails to show that claim 18 is unpatentable over the Abdelnur-Boutcher combination.

Independent claim 16 is similarly not shown to be suggested by the Abdelnur-Boutcher combination. Independent claim 16 claims a file interface card, which includes a substrate for removably coupling to system bus and the substrate having a processor and a specifically configured memory. The Abdelnur-Boutcher combination is not shown to teach these limitations. Abdelnur's processor 713 of

FIG. 7 is the processor for computer 700 as described in col. 12. Abdelnur does not suggest that the processor 713 is on a substrate having connectors for removably coupling to bus 718. Furthermore, Abdelnur's communications interface 720 is not suggested to have a processor and memory as does the claimed file interface card. Thus, Abdelnur's computer 700 clearly does not suggest the claimed file interface card that comprises a substrate that has connectors for removably coupling to the system I/O bus and having an IC including the specified processor, memory, and bus interface circuit. Therefore, claim 16 is not shown to be unpatentable over the Abdelnur-Boutcher combination.

Claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of claim 2 and further amended to clarify that the interceptor module executes on the first processor arrangement, which also executes the operating system. The file interface arrangement having the interceptor that executes with the operating system on the first processor arrangement, and the second processor arrangement which executes code that implements the standard NFS client protocol along with a non-standard extension, is not shown to be suggested by the Abdelnur-Boutcher combination. Abdelnur's computer 700 shows only a single processor 713, and Abdelnur's communications interface 720 is not shown to include a processor and a memory configured as described above. Therefore, the limitations of claim 1 are not shown to be suggested by the Abdelnur-Boutcher combination.


Other limitations in the claims are not shown to be suggested by the Abdelnur-Boutcher combination. For example, Boutcher teaches supporting different versions of a remote procedure. There is no apparent suggestion of non-standard extensions to a standard NFS client protocol as claimed. Others of the claims include limitations that further refine the limitations of independent claims 1, 16, and 18 as described above. Thus, these limitations are also not shown to be suggested by the Abdelnur-Boutcher combination.

The arguments set forth in the response dated September 28, 2004 which traversed the claim rejections over Abdelnur are maintained and incorporated by reference in this response.

Withdrawal of the rejections and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the remarks set forth above. No extension of time is believed to be necessary for consideration of this response. However, if an extension of time is required, please consider this a petition for a sufficient number of months for consideration of this response. If there are any additional fees in connection with this response, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0996 (HPCO.027PA).

Respectfully submitted,

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC  
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390  
Saint Paul, MN 55120  
(651) 686-6633

By:   
Name: LeRoy D. Maunu  
Reg. No.: 35,274